



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,522	10/15/2004	Hui-Fang Chang	100696-1P US	4428
22466	7590	03/07/2006	EXAMINER	
ASTRA ZENECA PHARMACEUTICALS LP GLOBAL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY 1800 CONCORD PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19850-5437			DESAI, RITA J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/511,522	Applicant(s) CHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Rita J. Desai	Art Unit 1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 13-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 17 and 18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/15/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-3,13-18 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

To satisfy the Written description requirement, applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to one skilled in the art, as of the filing date that applicant were in possession of the claimed invention. Applicant's claims are drawn to compounds that can treat or the prophylaxis of (human diseases) any disorder associated with an activity of $\alpha 7$ nicotinic receptor. The specification defines on pages 12 an assay to test the nicotine binding and affinity at $\alpha 7$ nAChR subtype with some binding affinity and are expected to have useful therapeutic activity. The specification gives no guidance to one of ordinary skill in the art that any disorder can be treated or even prevented.

The expression "treatment or prophylaxis of human diseases or condition in which activation of $\alpha 7$ nicotinic receptor is beneficial." does not convey to one of ordinary skill in the art that applicants were in possession of the claimed subject matter. The functional language

Art Unit: 1625

recited without any correlation does not meet the written description requirement for the expression “treatment or prophylaxis of human diseases or condition in which activation of $\alpha 7$ nicotinic receptor is beneficial “ as one of ordinary skill in the art could not recognize or understand which diseases /disorders are treated by the mere recitation of the function. Claims employing functional language at the point of novelty, such as applicants’, neither provide those elements required to practice the inventions, nor “inform the public” during the life of the patent of the limits of the monopoly asserted. The expression could encompass myriad of diseases and applicants claimed expression represents only an invitation to experiment regarding possible treatments.

The state of the art shows no relationship between the BTX binding assay and the nicotine binding assay on cessation of craving or jetlag or ulcerative colitis, being some of the diseases. There is no written description that the compounds can treat these various disorders let alone prevent them.

Also See English Abstract DN 121:222102 Jennifer Court et al recites that acute exposure to nicotine and nicotinic antagonists has beneficial and adverse effects on cognitive function.

Thus when the unpredictability is so high applicants as in the pharmaceutical art , the burden is on the applicant to provide a higher standard of description to convey with clarity that these compounds do treat all the various diseases.

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for some test data of nicotine and BTX binding assays , does not reasonably provide enablement for treating or prophylaxis of all these various diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Art Unit: 1625

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The state of the prior art: The state of the prior art is that it involves screening in vitro and in vivo to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activities. There is no absolute predictability and no established correlation between in vitro activity and the treatment of various diseases such as Alzheimer, Huntington disease, jetlag, pain as the in vitro data is not a reliable predictor of success even in view of the seemingly high level of skill in the art. The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. See English Abstract DN 121:222102 Jennifer Court et al which clearly teaches that acute exposure to nicotine antagonist has beneficial and adverse effects.

The level of predictability in the art: It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. In re Fisher, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18(CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. The level of unpredictability in the art is very high. The compounds which differ by a methyl group also show different properties, for e.g. theophylline and caffeine. One of them is a bronchodilator and they differ only by a methyl group.

The amount of direction provided by the inventor: The inventor provides very little direction

Art Unit: 1625

in the instant specification. There is no data that these compounds do prevent the above diseases.

The specifications on pages 11 and 12 give some assays and specification states that in at least one of the assays the compounds gave a K_i values of $< 1000\text{nM}$, indicating that they have a therapeutic activity. This is not enough for the compounds to be able to treat all the various human diseases or conditions as given in claim 13.

Given the unpredictability in the art the ability for all the compounds being able to treat the above disorders given the facts *is an invitation for experimentation*.

The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure: Thus the amount of experimentation is very high and burdensome.

Genetech Inc Vs Nova Nordisk 42 USPQ 2d 1001.

“A patent is not a hunting license. It is not a reward for search but compensation for its successful conclusion and patent protection is granted in return for an enabling disclosure of an invention, not for vague intimations of general ideas that may or may not be workable.”

Compounds according to the invention have been made. The assay test is noted. While screening test in an enzyme assay provides data in picking and choosing lead compounds for further testing, screening test per se does not provide sufficient operational guidance in an “individual” in patho-physiological environment.

Art Unit: 1625

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim recites treatment or prophylaxis of human diseases or conditions. This would consist of numerous diseases and compounds do not have an umbrella efficacy of treating any and all the diseases. The receptors are in different places and drugs may be acting at a different location, thus it would not be able to have a desired effect.

Conclusion

The compound claims 1-3, 17 and 18 are allowable over the prior art.

The claims 13-16 are not found to be allowable.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita J. Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-0684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rita J. Desai
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625

RJ Desai

3/3/06

R.D.
March 2, 2006